

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **3 April 2006**, the examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over alSafadi et al. (USPN 6,467,088, hereinafter “alSafadi”), in view of Henson et al. (USPN 6,167,383, hereinafter “Henson”).

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over alSafadi in view of Henson. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of alSafadi and Henson teaches having the reconfiguration manager determine, based upon a known list, a configuration to approve and to order (download) (see alSafadi, col. 2, lines 34-45). This list is limited to previously-stored known configurations for an electronic device (see alSafadi, col. 2, lines 37-41).

In contrast, the present invention determines memory upgrade options by examining specifications of memory modules which are currently available (see page 9, lines 20-22 of the instant application). Furthermore, the system can obtain up-to-date information on what memory modules are currently available via the Internet (see page 9, lines 24-25 of the instant application). This is advantageous because the present invention can present the most up-to-date options to the user. Furthermore, the present invention is not limited to a particular information source or stale information.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention obtains memory specification information for a memory upgrade option by accessing the Internet. This amendment finds support on page 9, lines 20-22, and on page 9, lines 24-25 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: 18 April 2006

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95616  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665  
Email: edward@parklegal.com